

THE CRISIS.

Devoted to the Support of the Democratic Principles of Jefferson.

"Union, harmony, self-denial, concession—everything for the Cause, nothing for Men."

No. 35.

RICHMOND, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1840.

VOL. I.

TERMS.

THE CRISIS will be printed in quarto form, on a medium sheet, with new type. The price \$1—and no paper will be sent to any person, without payment in advance, postage paid. As nothing short of a very large and effective subscription can justify the continuation of the paper, the above terms will be strictly adhered to. We mean to make no debts at all. We assure all credit in this establishment, and insist upon the Cash System.

POLITICAL.

To the People of Virginia.

A few words, fellow-citizens, we beg leave to lay before you on the eve of this important election! The argument is nearly exhausted, and it is almost time to act. It is scarcely necessary for us, at this eleventh hour, to enter into the merits of the controversy before you. The principles of the two parties, the qualifications of the two candidates, the abominable expedients and humbugs of the Whigs have been spread before you in every variety of form. The Address of the Richmond Convention of February, and the Address of the Charlottesville Convention of September, have touched all the great issues of the subject, and superseded the necessity of any elaborate appeal from our Central Committee.

You have now to choose between Martin Van Buren and Wm. H. Harrison. Can any staunch Republican of the Virginia State Rights School hesitate in his choice? Gen. Harrison is indebted for his nomination, not to the soundness of his political principles, but to very different considerations. He was selected on account of some military eclat, which was supposed to enoble his name; and by the very party, who had denounced the elevation of a Military Chieftain, as worse than "war, pestilence and famine." He was originally nominated in '36, by the anti-Masons, whose support he did not hesitate to seek by pledges indirectly given against the Masons. He was nominated at Harrisburg in December last, by the casting vote and the decided influence of the Abolitionists. Their motley ranks have been swelled by every man, who hated the administration of Martin Van Buren: who desires a National Bank, a Protective Tariff, a wild system of Internal Improvements, the distribution of the proceeds of the public lands; by the Federalist, who wishes to enlarge the powers of the General Government, by a latitudinous construction of the Constitution; by ambitious men, who would gratify their political aspirations by a change of the administration; by the friends of embarrassed banks; and by men, who seek to repair their fortunes, by a new extension of a swollen credit system. On no one great Constitutional question is General Harrison to be found with the Virginia School. He is a Latitudinarian in the construction of the Constitution. He approved of the Proclamation, before it was explained by General Jackson; and adopted Mr. Webster's speech upon it, as the most "satisfactory exposition of the principles of the Government." He will veto no bill for the establishment of a National Bank—and he is the candidate of the Bank men.—The Tariff men look to him for protection. The friends of Internal Improvement look to him for appropriations. The Clay men turn to him for a distribution of the proceeds of the public lands. The advocates of Assumption expect countenance, if not co-operation. What is still worse, he is the candidate of the Abolitionists. His elevation will expand that dark cloud, which now threatens the South. Not only has he avowed his anxiety to appropriate every cent of your surplus revenue to the purchase and emancipation of the slaves; but his Northern Whig friends are tacitly leagued with the Abolitionists. In Congress they have voted for the right of petition. In their State councils, they have lent "aid and countenance to the enemy." The danger is growing upon us. Their number is increasing; and their operations are extending to the World's Convention in London. Do we not see more of their friends returned to Congress? Can we be blind to the success, which they are giving to General Harrison in Ohio, and New York, and all the Northern States? If elected at all, he will be indebted for his success to the Abolitionists of New York and Ohio; and his elevation will become the signal of more extended operations. Petitions will be poured upon Congress, for the emancipation of the slaves in the District of Columbia. The torrent of Debate will continue to be rolled on—More and more agitation will be produced; until the North and the South will become more and more excited; more and more alienated from each other—and the Union itself will be exposed to the danger of dissolution. Such are the consequences, which

threaten us from the election of Gen. Harrison. On the other hand, Mr. Van Buren has always been characterized as "the Northern man with Southern feelings." He is a friend of a strict construction of the Constitution. He is opposed to an enlargement of the powers of the General Government; and he is, therefore, necessarily opposed to an increase of the Executive power.—No man has expressed a more "decided approbation of the doctrines of Virginia" than he has—no one has expressed a stronger "conviction of the benefits," (to use his own words,) "which have been derived from their influence; of the extent to which the future operations of our political institutions are dependent upon the continued respect and confidence in them, as well as (his) unfeigned admiration of the unsurpassed disinterestedness and inflexible fidelity, with which these doctrines have, through evil and through good report, been sustained by that truly patriotic member of the confederacy." He is solemnly pledged to veto a National Bank—as well as any bill, which touches the subject of slavery, let it approach us in any form it may assume. He has declared himself in his recent letter to the Whigs of Dutchess county, to be in favor of the course pursued by Congress, in putting all petitions to sleep, which relate even to the District of Columbia, or the Territories of the U. S. Under his auspices, therefore, we are safe from all debate, all agitation of the subject, in the National Councils.

Can you then, as friends of the Virginia State Rights School, hesitate in your choice between these two candidates? Can the friends of Southern Institutions be so infatuated as to prefer Harrison to Van Buren? The election of Harrison imparts new power and confidence to the fell spirits of Abolitionism—whilst it shakes our "natural allies, the Democracy of the North." How could you expect them to stand by you, when you do not stand by them: nor even by yourselves?

We appeal, therefore, to all your interests and to all your principles. You have a safe and able Chief Magistrate in Martin Van Buren. He is "honest, capable and faithful to the Constitution." Under his auspices, the rights of the States and of the People would be best secured against the encroachments of the Federal Government. No National Bank, no Protective Tariff, no wild system of Internal Improvements, no distribution of the proceeds of the Public Lands, and consequently no necessity to raise higher duties or to resort to loans to supply the deficiency. His influence would rebuke the efforts of Abolitionism, whilst it strengthens our legitimate friends in the Northern States. He would administer the Government by the force of his own understanding, and the lights of his own experience. But very different would be the issue, under General Harrison's auspices. His own want of qualification would subject him to the authority of superior minds. Daniel Webster and Henry Clay would become the lords of the ascendant. Their ultra Federal principles would control the measures of his Administration. The powers of the Federal Government would be enlarged, and every new power would necessarily swell the volume of the Executive influence. An immediate attempt would be made to establish a Mammoth Bank of the United States—affecting the politics and markets of the whole country—and centralizing in the North the monied power of the Union. The Tariff would be expanded. But we forbear to enlarge further upon these gloomy, yet rational anticipations. The details are revolting to all our feelings, and to all our principles.—The most significant forerunner of all these consequences is to be found in the late visit of D. Webster to your metropolis. Invited as he was, to preach politics from the portico of your capitol, you may see in his advent the certain sign of the coalition between the Federalists of Massachusetts and the Whigs of Virginia. It shadows forth his position in the coming Cabinet; and all the portentous measures, which his dark genius is destined to bring upon you. All his votes in opposition to the resolutions of Mr. Calhoun in '38, distinctly point out to you, the flood of petitions and the flame of agitations with which your rights and institutions are incessantly to be assailed.

We address your understandings alone. The friends of Mr. Van Buren have scorned all the arts and devices of the Opposition. They have spurned every appeal to the senses or the passions. They have enlisted no splendid pageants or log cabins; no such phantoms as have been raised about a standing army, or the Hooe case, or the census and direct tax. The Whigs as well as their candidate have shrunk from the exposition of their creed; whilst the Republicans have

boldly proclaimed their principles in the face of the nation. Judge ye between them!

We would warn you, Virginians, against the extravagant vaunts of the Whigs. If you believe them, the battle has already been fought and won. But believe them not. We have just carried the Keystone State by a vote of 7,000. James Buchanan writes on the 13th, that "we have carried the State by a triumphant majority of the Popular vote." The most authentic accounts represent her to be perfectly safe for Mr. Van Buren on Friday next. As Mr. Buchanan says, "we cannot then be defeated unless New York should abandon her own able, pure and illustrious Democratic son." But who can believe her capable of such gross infatuation? Will she be insensible to every motive which appeals to her pride, her principles or her patriotism?—But, in addition to these allies, we look to S. Carolina, to Tennessee, to Alabama and Mississippi, to Arkansas and Missouri, to Illinois, to New Hampshire and to Maine, (aye, to Maine, roused up and renovated and disenthralled from her temporary disaster.) Shall we ever despair of N. Carolina, and Georgia, and Maryland?—No—we never yield an inch of Southern ground to the very last moment. We shall never believe till the last bugle has sounded, that a single Southern slaveholding State has surrendered her institutions to the gripe of the enemy.

Onward, then, fellow-citizens, is the watchword.—The prospect is bright before us. Let us unite with the Keystone State, and the Empire State, in order to save the principles of the Republican Party, by re-electing Mr. Van Buren. Despise the idle and the habitual deceptions of the Whigs. They are insidiously attempting to paralyze your exertions, and to keep you from the polls. The expedient is only worthy of the tactics which has distinguished them during this whole campaign. Despise their braggadocias, as well as their threats. The election of Martin Van Buren hangs upon the vote of Virginia—Can you refuse to give him that vote?—But even if all our sister States were to desert us at this crisis, the necessity for your own exertion would be the greater; your victory would be the brighter; your future destiny would be the more glorious. What rational politician can expect any good from the Federal Dynasty? Who can expect any useful fruit from such a tree? "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?" It is the upas tree, which promises us nothing but poison. Come, then, to the rescue, fellow-citizens—and even if you were to stand alone, stand alone in vindicating your principles. To you would have to be committed the consecrated standard of '39. Virginia, which saved the country from Federal misrule in 1800—and which has since preserved our principles, would again become the flag-ship of the Republican party. Who would aspire to a higher distinction?

But as we tell you, fellow-citizens, that with the aid of your vote Mr. Van Buren may be re-elected; that as Pennsylvania is safe, and N. York will probably be with her; so it becomes our duty to warn them against the deceptions which may be practised upon them. We, therefore, tell Pennsylvania and N. York, not to fear Virginia. With your aid, we shall carry this State by a majority of several thousands. According to the estimate of the Charlottesville Convention in September last, the Republican ticket would have near 6,000 majority. Notwithstanding the ridiculous calculations of the late Whig Convention, we are satisfied that we shall triumphantly carry the State on the 2d of November. All our accounts from the country are of the most cheering description. Every day is adding to the ranks of the Democracy. The designs of the Whigs are becoming better understood. Their expedients more detested—The hopes of the Abolitionists more alarming—Their union with the Northern Whigs more distinctly unmasked. All the reports of our Committees in the several counties are calculated to encourage us. All our letters promise us the most auspicious results. Take one evidence only of the deceptive estimate of the Whig Convention.—They allow us only a majority of 500 in the South-western District. We had on Thursday last the authority of a gentleman who has just traversed the whole of that region, that "All is well in Hopkins' District—we should receive there a majority of from 1800 to 2000," exceeding our moderate estimate at Charlottesville by 6 to 800 votes. But still more! The Convention of Delegates which met at Abingdon on the 16th inst, made an estimate for themselves, and it "gives V. B. upwards of 1600 majority in the District.

To the Polls, then! To the Polls! Frown down these Federal politicians, and these pestilent Fanatics. The eyes of the whole Union are now fixed upon you. Virginia may be the battle-ground on which the whole campaign is to be decided. But triumph we certainly shall, if the Republicans will do their duty. Go forth, then, and let us have a fair decision by the People.—But no decision can be fair, unless the vote be a full one; and frauds be banished from the polls. Let the example of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, during the last year—let the complaints in Ohio about the spurious votes, which have been poured in upon her at the late election—let the developments which are at this moment breaking out in New York, of near \$50,000 being paid for inundating her with 1600 votes at \$30 a head, from Philadelphia, to carry her election in '38—let every consideration, which can address itself to our principles or our prudence, move us to watch every abuse of the right of suffrage.—Be not too sanguine, lest you become supine—but let every man of you go to the polls. Was there ever a time when Virginia should more anxiously call upon every Republican to do his duty, and give one day to the republic? We call especially upon all our County Committees to be at their posts. The Opposition is well organized. We must be so likewise. Distribute your tickets in due season—remember that the name of James Gibson of Hampshire has just been substituted for that of Hierome L. Opie, of the 15th District, on the Electoral Ticket: Remember the second day of November is the day of Election. Remember, too, that every man's vote in Virginia counts alike, whether he be on the shores of the Atlantic, or beyond the Mountains. The election is decided by the majority in the whole State, and not in any one county. Every vote may be important.—We have put the case fairly before you—and you must now decide. In the name of Old Virginia, of all her dearest principles; of all the Institutions of the South, and by your regard to the Union itself, we call upon every man to do his duty. Go forth, and strike a blow for your country. We have done our duty. Fellow-citizens the decision rests with you.

THOMAS RITCHIE,

Secretary to the Democratic Central Committee.
Richmond, Oct. 24, 1840.

The Battle of the 2nd November.

"Warn the Committees to be on their Guard."

[Jefferson's dying words.]

I feel it my duty, at this time, to address my brethren on the all-important and agitating question of the approaching Presidential Election. In doing so, I am free to confess the fears which I have felt in behalf of the Republic, in consequence of the unexpected results which have marked the Elections of late, in Ohio, New Jersey, Maine, Maryland and Georgia. But this should stimulate rather than depress us.—Has it not been well said, that the spirit of Freemen rises always in proportion to the pressure upon it? If so, is there any thing in these results why Virginia should not rise in the majesty of her strength, and rebuke the fanatical, anti-social, disorganizing spirit which has every where marked the conduct of our opponents? Old Pennsylvania has done her duty, and reanimated the Democracy throughout the Union—She has said, in a voice of thunder, that Martin Van Buren must be re-elected. If Virginia and New York but do their duty, he will be; and who doubts them? Our friends count certainly on carrying Maine in November—Maryland, New Jersey and Ohio voted in 1836, for General Harrison, and Georgia for Judge White. We can re-elect Martin Van Buren without the votes of either of these States.—Of the States which voted for Mr. Van Buren in 1836, North Carolina, Louisiana, Connecticut and Rhode Island—making 32 votes are doubtful for him in 1840. We have not yet despaired of them, but if they should go over to the enemy at this eventful crisis, their places will be in part supplied by South Carolina and Tennessee; and who doubts them?—Then let us answer for the conflict in November—let us gird on the Republican armor, and braving all danger for the success of our glorious cause, let us march forth "conquering and to conquer."—Fellow-citizens, we must not be overthrown—Our cause is just—our principles free, and who has a heart that does not beat in unison with justice and freedom? But Maine, Maryland, Georgia and Tennessee should shoot madly from their spheres, and rally under the standard of William Henry Harrison, the Federalist of the Reign of Terror, is that any reason why Virginia should give up her principles and support a man whose every act has been at war with her interests and her views of constitutional construction? Never, never let it be said that Va., the birthplace of Jefferson, Madison, and Henry, rendered immortal by her Resolutions of '98-9, in opposition to the encroachments of the Federal Government upon the rights of the States, during the administration of the elder Adams, and foremost in her opposition to that of his son, John Q. Adams—has abandoned all consistency and principle, and confided her highest trust to the hands of one who was a friend and advocate of both of those Administrations. Fellow-citizens, the position of Virginia at this time is full of interest.—

Whatever of indifference she might heretofore have justly felt in the well-grounded certainty of Mr. Van Buren's receiving the whole Southern vote, it cannot be disguised that events have transpired which should call forth all her energies, and place her foremost in maintaining the just rights of the South, and the true principles of the Constitution. It is not a little remarkable, that in all the severe political trials through which our country has passed, Virginia has had to bear her undue share.—Twice in our history have Federal Administrations been overthrown mainly by her patriotic exertions—and twice has she received the meed of praise from all her Republican sisters. The duty she has now to perform, is yet, if possible, still more arduous and important; and if she shall be able by a bold, decisive and energetic move to save our country from the misrule and corruptions of a Federal dynasty, put into power by means the most degrading, and misrepresentations the most flagitious that have ever characterized our party struggles at any former period—a glory will be hers that will far outstrip anything she has heretofore won in the list of contention with the enemies of our Constitution. Friends of Liberty! Republicans, ALL then prepare for the struggle, and be ready when the day arrives.

We might here content ourselves with this brief exhortation, and brief it should be, after so full and perfect an investigation into the principles and conduct of the candidates before you for the first office in your gift. But such is the importance of the principles involved in this contest, that we could not feel that we had entirely discharged our duty, to stop at this point. We hope, therefore, to be indulged in a brief review of the causes which have led us to oppose Gen. Harrison and to support the re-election of Martin Van Buren for the Presidency of the U. S.

Fellow-citizens! Have you ever voted for a Federalist to occupy the Presidential chair? If you have not, will you now vote for a Federalist? We are sure you would not knowingly do so.—After the overthrow of the Federal party in 1800 under the auspices of Mr. Jefferson, that distinguished and sagacious individual in his profound conception of the nature of man and of party said, (speaking of the Federalists,) that they never would attempt to reinstate themselves into power "*co nomine*," that is by the name of Federalists—but that they would assume some other name of a more popular import; and whilst their principles were unchanged, endeavor to persuade the people that they were the true friends of liberty. Hence we have found, that they have successively fought the Democratic party as Federal Republicans, as National Republicans, as Clay-men, and now as Whigs. Have they changed a principle, fellow-citizens! Not one—they are contending now under the name of Whig for precisely the same principles, which distinguished their early history, and supporting as their candidate a man who was the friend of the Administration of the Elder Adams.—Notwithstanding this fact there are many, no doubt, who call themselves Whigs and act with the Whig party, because they believe the Whigs are more friendly to liberty than the Democratic party. But this is not so. The present Whig party is the old Federal party. The old Federalists sustained John Adams rather than Thomas Jefferson—the present Whigs sustain General Harrison, a political lineal descendant of Mr. Adams, rather than Martin Van Buren, a disciple of the school of Jefferson. We ask then, fellow-citizens! will you support a Federalist? If you will not, we will show you by reference to facts, that you cannot, if you would, doubt that General Harrison is a Federalist and always has been. The evidence to prove him one is so clear and conclusive, that not a man can doubt it who will give the subject a fair and candid investigation.

Where then do we first hear of Gen. Harrison in a civil point of view? As Secretary of the North Western Territory, in the year 1798, during the Administration of the elder Adams, acknowledged on all hands to be the great leader of the Federal party in the United States at that time. From whom did he receive that appointment? Think you, it was from the hands of a Republican President? No, fellow-citizens, he was the friend and favorite of Mr. Adams, and, as such, was appointed to a lucrative station by him, at a period when, as Mr. Jefferson said, "unsentimental differences of opinion were made the rule and passport to office;"—at a period when Nicholas and others denounced this rule for appointments to office; and when the leading Federalists, in reply, Sitgreaves, Smith, Harper, &c., openly justified the President for making his appointments from among those "exclusively who were of his own political opinions;"—at a period, when McHenry, Secretary at War, declared that he would make no appointments in the Army but of "Spirits not disaffected, and that prominent and known characters must certify the principles of the applicants." It was during this year, that the Alien and Sedition Laws, the law for raising a standing army, and the commission of General Harrison received the signature of the President; and what renders the coincidence still more remarkable, is, that they were all signed by him with-

in the same month. Can you doubt, then, fellow-citizens, that Gen. Harrison, at this period, was a black cockade, Alien and Sedition law Federalist? It does seem to us that you cannot. But the proof does not stop here. In 1799, Gen. Harrison was elected as a delegate to Congress from the North-western Territory. What does he do? Any thing to weaken the testimony we have adduced of his Federalism? No; but on the contrary, everything to strengthen it. In 1806, he said, that the opinions of his constituents were concurrent with those of Mr. Adams; and, as evidence of it, he referred to their address to that personage, assuring him of their approbation. This fact is mentioned as showing the relation between the delegate and constituent, that others may draw their own conclusions as to what must have been the opinions of the delegate. To our mind, it is impossible for any one to believe that he was not the political and personal friend of Mr. Adams. But as soon as Gen. Harrison had taken his seat, Mr. Harper, a zealous Federalist, moved to clothe him with the prerogatives of pay and frankage. Would he have done so, had he been inimical to the measures of the previous year? Gen. Harrison then introduced a bill for establishing the Territory of Indiana. It was attacked by Mr. Jackson of Virginia; was sustained with great zeal by Gen. Harrison; became a party measure, and carried through as such. Mr. Adams signed the bill the 7th day of May, 1800, and five days after, Harrison's nomination as Governor was sent to the Senate, in the midst of the Reign of Terror. Would this have been so, had Harrison not been a Federalist? But the "Aurora," at that time the organ of the Republican party, and sustained by contributions from Jefferson and Madison, ranked unhesitatingly General Harrison with such Federalists as Otis, Ross, Chipman, Morris, Pickering, Tracy, Bayard, Dayton, Goodhue, Harper, &c. Would the Aurora have done so, had General Harrison been a Republican? never. But the Aurora, not content with thus classing Harrison with the Federalists, lampoons the party by providing a library for them and for each leader a treatise peculiar to his taste. He allots to Gen. Harrison "*Barratarius* or Sancho would be Governor!" This would be conclusive of Harrison's Federalism, but we will not stop here. During the interval between Harrison's first and second appointment under Mr. Adams, an effort was made by the Republican party to disband the standing army which had been created, on a pretext of war with France. This measure was odious in the eyes of the whole Republican party. It called forth an indignant remonstrance from the Virginia Legislature in the shape of instructions to our Senators in Congress. At the very time when this protest was under the consideration of the General Assembly, a powerful effort was made by Messrs. Gallatin, John Randolph and others in the House of Representatives, to reduce the army: it was resisted by Messrs. Otis, Harper, and the other Federalists. It was on this occasion that Gen. Harrison took the floor on behalf of the Federal Administration, and made a speech in opposition to the measure. It was on all hands considered a strong party measure.—Would Gen. Harrison have united with the Federalists on this occasion, had he not been one of them? unquestionably not. So much for Gen. Harrison's connexion with the early history of the Federal party. We next hear of him in the Congress of the U. S. as Chairman of the Military Committee of that body, proposing one of the most expensive and burdensome schemes ever heard of to organize the militia of the Union. His proposition maintained, that every boy in the U. S. should be educated at the public expense; that the President should address his orders to some officer of the militia, and not to the Executive of any State; that one hundred and fifty thousand officers should be trained by the General Government thirty days each year, at an annual expense of three millions of dollars; that the militia should furnish their own arms; should be assembled in camps of discipline and be subject to the rules and articles of war. His vote is also on record in favor of imposing a fine upon the militia, for appearing to be trained without arms under the existing law; thus showing conclusively that he did not support the Standing Army of John Adams, as called for by any pressing exigency, but was in favor of the principle of such an establishment for political purposes. This scheme was so monstrously absurd, that Congress refused even to discuss it. Yet General Harrison has avowed, in a letter to the Louisville Legion, as late as February last, that his opinions on this subject are unchanged. This, then, is another evidence of his Federalism. We are aware, that an effort will be made to break the force of this objection by referring to the late plan of Mr. Poinsett. In reply, we say, the plan referred to was Mr. Poinsett's, and called out by a resolution of Congress; that, so far from the President's coinciding with this plan, he has objected to some of its provisions and evinced no disposition whatever to press the subject in any form upon Congress.

We will now trace him down a little farther.—And where do we next find him? In the Legislature of Ohio, in 1819, advocating the most ultra and latitudinous Federal doctrines that have ever been broached in this country. We all know that Mr. Clay has been con-

sidered the leader of the Tariff party in Congress, and for it, has been rendered so obnoxious to a majority of the people, that with all his commanding talents and qualifications, he has been twice defeated for the Presidency. yet Mr. Clay never went further in his advocacy of the Tariff than to give to the manufacturer an indirect bounty, by way of protection against foreign competition; but we find General Harrison, in 1819, during a period of great distress in the country, actually offering and sustaining resolutions in the Legislature of Ohio, to instruct the Senators from that State not to protect domestic manufactures by a prohibition on foreign articles, as was Mr. Clay's plan, but to pay direct bounties from the Federal Treasury. He was also in favor of exempting the operatives in the manufacturing establishments, as well as the establishments themselves, from all taxation whatever, under State authority. Not content with this exemption, he even went so far as to say, that the individuals interested in those establishments should not be compelled to perform military duty. Was ever such a Federal doctrine as this broached before by any Statesman in our Country? Yet General Harrison's friends say he is no Federalist! At the same time, and under the same circumstances, he advocated instructions to carry on Internal Improvements, not as a national undertaking on constitutional grounds, but simply to relieve the pecuniary embarrassments of the people; and yet General Harrison is no Federalist. Will his friends please point out the provision of the Constitution which authorizes the appropriation of money for such a purpose?

Gen. Harrison's views of the power of Congress to charter a National Bank are exceedingly dangerous and latitudinarian. In 1822 he said a Bank was unconstitutional. Believing this, his oath would require of him to veto a bill to charter one; but in his letter to Sherrod Williams he says he will approve a bill chartering a Bank, if Congress shall pass one. Ought such a man as this to be trusted in the Presidential chair—one who has so little idea of the sanctity of an oath, and so little respect for the great charter of our liberties? Upon the subject of banking and currency he has evinced more ultra-Federal latitudinarianism than any other man in the U. S. He has favored the idea of an exclusive metallic currency—a Government paper, and of a mixed currency—he has been opposed to a National Bank and to State Banks—he is now not only in favor of them, but is willing to tolerate an inconvertible paper currency.—He once voted to take away from the late National Bank its charter, and advised Mr. Monroe to remove the deposits from the Branch in Cincinnati.—He now says he will give a charter for such an institution and restore the deposits for banking purposes. Does not this show that Gen. Harrison has no settled opinions and is a Federalist?

We submit once more the following extract from the General's Address of the 4th July 1833, at Cheviot, Ohio—compare the principles avowed in this extract with Mr. Madison's resolutions in 1798-99, and then ask yourselves if he is not a Federalist of the most decided stamp?

"I have thus, fellow-citizens, endeavored to explain to you the principles upon which the Government of our Union is formed. I recommend to you, however, the Proclamation of the President of the U. States, issued on the 10th of December and the speeches of Webster, delivered in the Senate of the U. States at their last session, in answer to the arguments of Mr. Calhoun, as containing the MOST ELOQUENT AND SATISFACTORY exposition of those principles that have recently been published. By issuing that Proclamation, I think Gen. Jackson has rendered a service to his country of GREATER magnitude than his splendid victory at New Orleans."

The Proclamation contains the most satisfactory exposition of the principles of our Government! Why, this is the very paper, which has given so much alarm to the orthodox friends of the President, and to the friends of the Constitution. So sensible was the President himself of the constructions of which it was susceptible, that he had the candor and magnanimity to come out, through an authoritative article in the Globe, and deny the constructions which had been given to it. And that construction he authorized the Editor of the Enquirer to hold, as binding upon him as if it had been signed "Andrew Jackson"—yet General Harrison, say his friends, is no Federalist! We understand that some of the Whig Orators, and among them Wm. C. Rives, have stated before the people, that General Harrison has authorized them to say it was the greatest error of his life. This is of no avail, for the sentiments were avowed some six or seven months after the Proclamation appeared, and after full time had been allowed to weigh well and canvass the principles it promulgated. But Gen. Harrison has never recanted in any form entitled to respect. If he has furnished letters for the "private eye," and such uses as his friends may see fit to make of them, it is but another evidence of the shuffling and prevarication which has marked his whole conduct throughout the whole of the existing canvass. Has Mr. Webster recanted his speeches in favor of the Proclamation? No. Then has not Gen. Harrison, for Mr. Webster has made him his "standard-bearer."

But General Harrison contends that Congress has power, with the consent of the States, to appropriate

the Surplus Revenue towards the emancipation of slaves. In 1835, in his Cheviot Speech he takes this ground, and never to this day has he recanted the opinion, fraught as it is with danger to Southern property, and palpably unconstitutional. We could here illustrate the danger of this scheme, and show that it is, in fact, a more direct approach to Abolition than even a concession of the right by Congress to abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia; but as this topic has heretofore been dilated on at length, we pass it over as another conclusive evidence of ultra Federalism against Gen. Harrison.

In 1834, we find General Harrison in the Senate of the United States, where he invariably voted with the Federal Party, and remained for several years in steady opposition to the South. He voted for the Tariffs of '24 and '28, and recognized in every form the power of Congress over Internal Improvements. He was an Elector in Ohio on the ticket in favor of J. Q. Adams—he sustained all the measures of his Administration—and finally accepted the profitable Mission to Bogota in 1838, whence he was recalled by Gen. Jackson on his accession to the Presidency, and ever afterwards was a bitter opponent of his Administration. Was not the Administration of Mr. Adams Federal? This then is the evidence of his own acts to prove Gen. Harrison a Federalist.

But the proof is yet abundant; we can but barely glance at it. It having been so repeatedly published in the newspapers of the day, its existence and respectability will not be denied.

In 1826, Mr. Randolph and Gen. Harrison met in the Senate of the U. States. A debate sprung up on an appropriation to the Cumberland road, which Mr. Randolph and the great body of the Republican party opposed—Gen. Harrison and the Federal party supported it. In the course of that debate, Mr. Randolph, with a full and perfect knowledge of Gen. Harrison's politics, made the following distinct charge, which he never recanted or modified to the day of his death:

"Now, Sir, the only difference between the gentleman from Ohio, and myself is this—and it is vital: That gentleman and myself differ fundamentally and totally, and did differ when we first took our seats in Congress—he as a delegate from the Territory North-west of the river Ohio, I as a member of the other House from the State of Virginia: he was an open, zealous, frank supporter of the Sedition law and Black cockade Administration, and I was as zealous, frank and open an opponent of the Black cockade and Sedition law Administration.—We differ fundamentally and totally—we never can agree about measures or about men. I do not mean to dictate to the gentleman—let us agree to differ as gentlemen ought to do, especially natives of the same State who are antipodes to each other in politics. He, I acknowledge, just now, the zenith and I the nadir—but, unless there is something false in the philosophy of the schools, in the course of time even these will change their places." (And the prophecy was soon verified in the election of Gen. Jackson, and the downfall of J. Q. Adams and his party.)

This charge, Gen. Harrison, so far from denying at the time, expressly admitted, to a certain extent. He said:

"As I was upon terms of intimacy with the gentleman, it is very probable that he might have heard me express sentiments favorable to the then Administration. I certainly felt them—so far, at least, as to the course pursued by it in relation to the Government of France."

Though it would seem here that Gen. Harrison was not in the habit even at this early period of making disclosures for the "public eye," but reserved the expression of his opinions for those who were on "terms of intimacy" with him, yet in another part of his reply, he virtually admits the whole of Mr. Randolph's charge by a broad and sweeping compliment to the honesty and patriotism of Mr. Adams, in which he was sustained, he said, by those honest and upright men, John Marshall and James A. Bayard. Lives there a man within the limits of Virginia who could point his finger to the grave of Mr. Randolph and say, "There lies a calumniator?" No, fellow-citizens; Mr. Randolph never told a lie.—But Gen. Harrison refers to the proceedings of the Territorial Legislature as having supported him in his favorable opinions of Mr. Adams. What does he say?

"Nor, said Mr. H., was I unsupported in that opinion by those who had a right to control my actions, if not my opinions. In no part of the country were those measures more decidedly approbated than by my immediate constituents—the Legislature of the North-western Territory, as the address of that body to the President during that session will show."

Now, what were those proceedings, do you think, fellow-citizens? Read the following extract from the address to which he alludes, and you will see they were an out and out approbation of all the measures of Mr. Adams:

"But happily for America, you chose to continue in public life, till the confidence of your fellow-citizens, at a critical moment, placed you at the helm of State; and permit us, sir, to assure you that we are deeply im-

pressed with a sense of the wisdom, justice and firmness with which you have discharged this important trust—and we take this early opportunity of assuring you of our sincere attachment to the American Constitution and Government, and of our determination to afford every possible support to both.

"We believe that regardless of party spirit, which has striven to distract our national councils, you have kept the honor and happiness of the nation constantly in view; and we ardently pray that the wise Ruler of Nations may preserve your health and life.

EDWARD TIFFIN,
Speaker of the H. of R.
H. VANDERBURGH,
President of the Council."

Here, then, is Gen. Harrison's own confession of having been a Federalist in the "Reign of Terror," yet the Whigs deny he is a Federalist!

But Mr. Randolph's declaration is not unsustained by direct and unimpeachable evidence.

What said Mr. Mills, one of the venerable Vice Presidents of the Democratic Indiana Convention?

"That he was in Cincinnati when Gen. Harrison returned from Congress during the administration of John Adams, with a black cockade in his hat, and that all the Federalists in the city followed his example and hoisted the odious badge of Federalism."

It is only necessary to add, that party violence has never dared to question the credibility of this witness.

Judge Wick, a member of Congress from Indiana, said, at the Shuter's Hall celebration near Alexandria, on the 4th July last—

"That he had the statement from an old citizen of Indiana, whose character was above suspicion or impeachment, that "General Harrison for months, to his knowledge, had worn the black cockade of the Federal party and sustained the administration of the elder Adams."

Robert Price, a respectable citizen of Trumbull County, Ohio, sworn before F. P. Stevens, one of the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas of the County of Erie, on the 20th June, 1840:

"That he frequently saw Harrison and heard him converse at the time of the great political excitement when the Federal party wore the Black Cockade as a mark of distinction, shows that he has frequently seen him wear the Black Cockade, and heard him say, in defence of the Sedition Law, in the presence of Charles Pemberton and others, that the President and members of Congress should not be in the mouth of every blackguard that walked the street."

Next comes the venerable John Fowler of Kentucky, a member of Congress, in the days of Adams and Jefferson. What does he say?

"LEXINGTON, June 27, 1840.

"In answer to your letter of this date, I will say," that I know the fact, that William Henry Harrison, then a Delegate from the Northwestern Territory, was upon the side of Mr. Adams. He was a Federalist, and wore the Black Cockade."

What is the testimony of Capt. Jacob White, a most respectable witness, whose character is sustained by the Report of the Congressional Committee of Revolutionary pensions?

"He said he had for a long period of time been upon the most intimate terms with Gen. Harrison, and he well knows he has seen him wear the black cockade." We will add that no man entertained a higher opinion of Capt. White than Gen. Harrison himself—of which it is stated Capt. White has abundant evidences in a number of letters and other papers from Gen. Harrison's own hand.

John Osborn, one of the first inhabitants of the State of Ohio, a man whom none dare contradict in the language of the Ohio Statesman, stated in a public meeting and his statement was confirmed by the President, Samuel Calwell:

"That he saw Gen. Harrison wear the black cockade and knew him to be a supporter of the Elder Adams' gag-law."

The next witness in support of Mr. Randolph's charge, is the venerable and venerated octogenarian from Ulster county, N. Y., Lucas Elmendorf; he states that "he was a member of Congress during the whole period of the Administration of the Elder Adams, and two years of Mr. Jefferson's, and that Gen. Harrison manifested by an unusual boldness, his flaming attachment to the measures of the Adams Administration, and that his appointment of Governor of Indiana was the result."

Now, fellow-citizens, what have you a right to expect if General Harrison should be elected President?—Think you, his administration will not be hostile to all the principles for which Virginia has ever contended? Can you doubt it? Yet his friends say, in the face of this mass of testimony, that he is a Jeffersonian Republican! Can he be? Is it not absolutely insulting your intelligence? What measures, then, will he pursue? His Committee have said that his opinions on all the great questions of the day "have undergone no change." He has never, that we are aware of, recanted his approval of the principles of Mr. Adams' administration—

He says he thinks he did right in approving and sustaining laws to sell, whip and imprison white men and women. He has never recanted his views upon the bank question; upon the Tariff; upon Internal Improvements; upon Distribution; upon the Proclamation; upon a Bankrupt Law, or upon Abolition. Nor has he ever recanted the principles put forth in his monstrous report of 1817, to convert, by organizing the militia, our Republic into a military despotism. What measures, then, we ask, will General Harrison pursue, if elected? Let him answer. In his Dayton Speech, so late as the 10th September last, he tells you plainly enough what he will do:—"If the candidate for so high an office be designated by the will of a portion or a majority of the people, they will have come to the determination of sustaining such a man, from a review of his past actions and life, and they will not exact pledges from him of what he will do and what he will not do, for their selection of him is proof enough that he will carry out the doctrines of his party." * * * "Were any pledges required of your Washington or your Adams? Adams was the candidate of the Federal party, and as a statesman was bound to carry out the principles of his party."

We have thus shown you, fellow-citizens, that Gen. Harrison is a Federalist by his acts, his votes, his confessions, and by direct and positive testimony from sources entitled to your respect and confidence. Can you then, will you, we earnestly and anxiously ask, vote for a Federalist to be President of these United States? We rely with confidence upon your decided negative at the polls on the 2d of November.

Fellow-citizens! you elected Martin Van Buren in 1836. You then would have nothing to do with Wm. Henry Harrison. Are you now going to reverse what you then did? For what? Is Gen. Harrison less obnoxious to you now than then? Has he changed an iota of his principles? No. What has Martin Van Buren done that you should not trust him again? He has fulfilled all the pledges he gave you before his election. He has stood nobly by the South on the Bank, Tariff, Internal Improvement and Abolition questions. In fact, he has shown himself a Northern man with true constitutional principles. As an evidence of this, such men as Calhoun, Hayne, McDuffie and Tazewell have been compelled to lay aside their prejudices, and rally in support of the Administration. This ought to be a sufficient testimonial that the Government has been correctly administered. We will not go further back than 1836, when you called him by an overwhelming vote to the first office in your gift, than to say he was always a distinguished champion in the Democratic ranks, and as such, supported Mr. Jefferson and the embargo, when but eighteen years of age—Mr. Madison and the War, when but a very young man—those two able and distinguished Republicans, Lewis and Tompkins, in all their war measures, and never failed to co-operate in every particular, when uninstructed, with our most straight-laced Southern State Rights politicians. You passed upon his merits and qualifications in 1836; he has more than realized the expectations of his friends, and sadly disappointed the prophetic warnings of his enemies. We will not insult you by one moment supposing, that you acted either ignorantly or foolishly in bestowing upon him your suffrages in 1836. Well, fellow-citizens, what has occurred since that period why you should withhold your confidence from Martin Van Buren? We tell you upon our honor NOTHING, nothing on earth. Even if his competitor were as fit and as pure as his friends represent him, there would be no reason for removing Mr. Van Buren. But when we have demonstrated that he is infinitely worse than even they would have you believe Mr. Van Buren to be, we are sure you can find no justification for taking the one and rejecting the other. The Whigs, as if conscious of the superior claims of Mr. Van Buren upon the country, have abandoned all fair discussion and all fair means, and resorted to a system of gross misrepresentation and humbuggery, for the purpose of sustaining their candidate, and thus virtually admitting his unfitness for the station. When, before, have we witnessed such degrading exhibitions as have characterized the proceedings of our opponents since the nomination of Gen. H.? Never. They have never relied on electing him upon the faith of any given set of principles, in any address to the American People, whose suffrages they ask. They have not asked you to vote for him, because he entertained this or that opinion on some great question of national polity; but because, as they have falsely asserted, Mr. Van Buren has been prodigal of the public money—because defaults have taken place under his Administration—because he was in favor of a Standing Army—of negro testimony against white men—of imposing a direct tax, and so on—and because he has been guilty of proscription, and is seeking to enlarge Executive power. Fellow-citizens, it cannot be necessary for us, at this time, to enter into an investigation of these idle and ridiculous charges. We know you must be satisfied already of their entire falsity. The fact that these misrepresentations have been resorted to, together with log cabins, hard cider, banners, and so on, to deceive the

people, furnishes to our mind the most conclusive evidence that Mr. Van Buren is orthodox on all the great questions of constitutional law.—But one question has divided the country since his election—that question is the Sub-Treasury, or the collection and safe-keeping of the public money by individual officers appointed under the Constitution by the President and Senate. It is now the law of the land, after full, mature and deliberate consideration on the part of the people; it is an antagonist measure to a National Bank; and as such, far preferable to that dangerous and unconstitutional institution. Whatever differences of opinion may have heretofore existed in the Republican party, our opponents are *stopped*, as the lawyers would say, from urging any objection to the scheme; for, in 1834, when a similar measure was before Congress through Gen. Gordon of Albemarle, then a Whig member, every Whig in the House of Representatives voted for it, and it received the support of the party throughout the Union. Then, the Banks paid specie; but, in 1837, two suspensions had intervened, and Mr. Van Buren renewed the measure. At this time, the Whigs wheeled right about, and have ever since denounced it for the very opposite of the effects they said it would produce in 1834. Can you put any faith in the principles and practices of a party guilty of such remarkable inconsistencies?

Fellow-citizens, we might have been satisfied by simply warning you of the importance of action, *decided, energetic action*, in the coming contest, so well convinced were we that nothing more was necessary to satisfy you of the futility and groundlessness of the charges brought by our opponents against the Administration; but as this is the last opportunity we shall have of communing with our brethren in Virginia before the Presidential Election, and as these charges may be repeated on the day of election by unscrupulous and heated partisans, we cannot too strongly or too often urge their refutation upon our friends, and call upon them to be *ready—ALWAYS READY—to nail them as BASE COINS to the counter.*

The Hooe Case.

This case has been the occasion of more misrepresentation and injustice towards the President, than perhaps any of the various *humbugs* that have been conjured up by Whig *legerdemain*, since the stipulated accession to their ranks of Abolitionism at Harrisonburg, gave earnest of a possibility of success in November next. It is hard to decide, which of the humbugs that have been played off on the public mind to injure Mr. Van Buren, is most unfounded. The Missouri humbug, the Negro Suffrage humbug, the Blood-hound humbug, the Standing Army humbug, the Public Expenditure humbug, the Default humbug, the Census humbug, the Furniture of the white house humbug, the Log Cabin and Hard Cider humbug, or this humbug of which we are now writing. One thing is very true, and that one thing is the thing "needful" with the Whigs in the canvass now going on—There is no subject upon which the public mind can be more easily excited and led astray, than this case of Lieut. Hooe—and that of itself, apart from the real facts and the real justice of the case, is inducement enough with so reckless and unprincipled an Opposition as we have to encounter, to distort and misrepresent the facts of the case. In this occupation, next to a certain Congressional Captain, the Whig of this city has been busily employed. In North Carolina, so serious a matter did they make of this case, and with such confidence and *modesty* assert that Mr. Van Buren had authorized negroes to testify against white men in the South, that a citizen of that State was induced to address the President a letter, asking him whether such a charge could be true. The President, in this as in all the other cases of injustice against him, when called out by friends or foes, conscious of his innate rectitude of intention, responds fully and satisfactorily, setting forth in a clear, impartial and forcible manner, all the facts of the case, stating everything and concealing nothing. Upon such a letter as this, it has been the province and first duty of the Whig to pounce with a vulture-like rapacity, and to gnaw with all the heartiness of the fabled Anthropophagi, the very heart, liver and soul of his doomed victim. How much more honorable and magnanimous it would have been, had he generously come forward in the spirit of a gallant enemy, and said, with the accomplished Editor of the Lexington Gazette, (Mr. Baldwin,) "we can't be silent, and will not lie." However much we have been disposed heretofore to censure Mr. Van Buren in this affair, we are now satisfied from the plain statement he has made of the case, that we have done him injustice. We have heretofore believed, that he had sanctioned the introduction of negro testimony, but he now tells us, that it is impossible for him to remedy the defect of the law, and even goes so far against such testimony as to say—"But, whilst I have not the constitutional power to alter the law, I have no hesitation in saying, that I have not been able to discover a sufficient reason why the rule which prevails with the consent and approbation of all in the judicial, should not be extended to the military tribunals of the country." Could the Whig have been guilty of such an acknowledgment as this, it would have saved to his

party many an honorable man, who cannot now, when he sees the illiberal and disingenuous comments made by him on Mr. Van Buren's manly letter, longer remain in the ranks of a party having an organ so discreditable to that party. But, *quem deus vult perdere prius dementat*, whom the Gods wish to destroy, they first make mad. The Whig has been incapable of this generous act. The madness of party has led him to hope for success in a studied departure from justice. Heretofore, the Whig has contended, that Lieut. Hooe was suspended on the "strength" of negro testimony. We drove him from that *fastness*, by showing that the negroes testified to none of the specifications of which Hooe was convicted, or if they did, that their testimony was disregarded in the abundance of *white* testimony on the same charges.

The question, then, was truly as Mr. Van Buren stated it, not whether Lieut. Hooe had been convicted on the "strength" of negro testimony, but "whether the admission of illegal evidence (assuming it to be so) to substantiate parts only of the charges, ought to be allowed to invalidate the finding of the Court in regard to those charges which were established to the satisfaction of the Court by other and unquestionable evidence." This was the question for Mr. Van Buren to decide, and in its decision, he but sustained the decision of the Court Martial which tried Lieut. Hooe, itself composed of a majority of Southern officers, and Whigs too, we believe, by whom Hooe was willing to be tried, and who were not and could not be suspected of any favoritism towards the reception of negro testimony, and therefore, must have acted under a sense of their conviction as to what the law required of them. He but sustained the decision of the law-officers of the Government, who reported that the testimony of the negroes proved nothing against Hooe, and that it was a principle of common law, well established and well known, that a verdict never can be set aside on an allegation of illegal testimony, when substantial justice has been done, and the testimony complained of had had no influence in the decision of the case. He but sustained the decision of the Secretary of the Navy—a man, who has been denounced by the Abolitionists for the service he rendered the South, in a work he wrote in defence of slavery. He had nothing to do with the admission of the testimony. He was not present, and knew nothing of the proceedings *even*. He had no vote on the question. The Court, composed of a majority of Southern officers, read and admitted the testimony. They, if any, are to blame—and why does not the Whig spend some of his bilious matter upon them?—why all upon Mr. Van Buren, who was merely called on to supervise the proceedings, and when he did so, after full investigation, on an issue altogether different, said there was no cause for him to interfere in the case of Lieut. Hooe.

This is a history of the case so far as the President had any thing to do with it. Could he have taken any other course, in the face of so much concurrent testimony, without bringing down upon himself the anathemas of the country, for usurping the legislative power of the country? That he has not done so, under a mistaken sympathy for the feelings of the South, is a subject of gratulation to all those who value the institutions under which they live. Here, however, the Whigs thought proper to lay hold of the matter, as a means of making political capital, and the Hon. J. M. Botts was pitched upon as a suitable individual to be made "*pater noster*" of the disreputable and disgraceful project—and after all, what did they do? Not an earthly thing.—Those who dared abuse Van Buren for admitting negro testimony against white men, when he had no power to prevent it, did not themselves dare, through the only competent tribunal to act upon the subject, and challenged to it, by the friends of Mr. Van Buren, to say that negroes should not in future be allowed to testify against officers of the Navy. The votes of these very men will show, that they opposed every effort to legislate on the subject of the Hooe case, doubtless for fear *only* of offending Slade, Clarke, Saltonstall and a host of other Abolitionists, with whom Southern Whiggery has formed a league to overthrow the last Republican and patriot Administration that may perhaps ever exist in this country, if *overthrown*.

But apart from official action on this subject, there is yet high authority for Mr. Van Buren. The Lexington Gazette, a talented Whig paper, presents a calm, dispassionate view of the subject, in striking contrast with the low, vulgar, miserable caricature of the Whig—a view, which, in these party times, reflects much credit on the fairness and candor of that print. He maintains, that it would have been as absurd in the President to set aside the finding of the Court convicting the accused upon the charges and specifications to which the negro testimony was not applicable, as it would be in an ordinary Court of criminal jurisdiction, to set aside a conviction of murder on one indictment, because improper evidence was admitted upon another. Having illustrated this point, he proceeds to another, as follows, viz:

"By the common law, and the uniform practice of the Navy under it, negroes are competent witnesses against white men. They are not permitted to testify against white men in Virginia, because that is very properly forbidden by an express law of the State.—They are good witnesses, however, in many of the free States.—

They were, then, competent legal witnesses in the case. The question then arises, what right has the Federal Executive to repeal the laws of the land, merely because he may deem them inexpedient? Are our Whig friends—the freemen of this land—prepared to surrender this monstrous and despotic authority into the hands of the Federal Executive? Yet this is the very principle involved in the case, for the President is universally censured by the Whig press, because he would not repeal the law of the land authorizing negroes to give evidence against white men. As a Whig, as a Republican, intensely jealous of Federal encroachments, nay, more, as an American freeman, we, for one, enter our protest against such a monstrous usurpation of power by the Federal Executive.

"Let us not be misunderstood. We are no advocates for negro evidence against white men. On the contrary, we are strongly opposed to it. But let the loathsome, the disgraceful, the degrading law be repealed by Congress—by the Representatives of the people—not by the Federal Executive. What freeman can tolerate the bare idea of Executive legislation? Give this power to your Executive, and he is a despot, and you are his slaves."

Thus saith a Whig Editor in Virginia! Come from what quarter it may, it is true Democratic doctrine.

Well, what is the point of attack against the President in this case? It is, that he has not ALTERED THE LAW! It is, that he has not USURPED THE RIGHTFUL POWER OF CONGRESS! **Botts & Co.** call on the South to oppose the President, because he has not in this case become an USURPER! Yes, the very men who daily and recklessly charge him with usurpation, complain of him also because he does not *usurp the law-making power!*

It is not at all remarkable, that the Whig Editor of the Gazette should think it necessary to give reasons for venturing to be honest in any thing which relates to the Administration. Honesty and candor are so rare in the newspapers of that party, that we never expect to meet with them without an apology. Hear what Mr. Baldwin says:

"We have been told by some of our friends, that it was very imprudent in us to express this opinion; that it might be used to injure the Whig cause. To this, we have two brief replies: First—We shall always do justice, we scorn, even to our worst enemies, 'though the heavens fall.' We scorn that pusillanimous, criminal prudence, which, for party purposes, would countenance injustice even to a foe. We were taught by maternal piety, that honesty was the best policy; that the right was always the most prudent; and, may the lightnings of Heaven blast us, if we ever forget the lesson. We owe a higher allegiance to truth than to party."

"Our second reply is, that we can't help blabbing right out whatever we think. We abhor all concealment and scorn all trickery. A manly frankness, a lofty independence, an ingenious candor, we estimate above all price, as one of the noblest traits of the human character. In a word, such unfortunately is our moral constitution, that

"We can't be silent and we will not lie."

"We hope our friends are satisfied. We need not say, that the columns of our paper are open to the freest discussion of the whole subject."

The Pensacola Gazette, another Whig print, says:

"Nothing has come to our knowledge which more strongly marks the rabidity, the madness of party spirit, than the use which the Whigs are now making of the Hooe Case. Mr. Hooe, a Lieutenant in the Navy, and then recently a first lieutenant of the ship, was tried by a court martial assembled on board the frigate *Macedonian*, then lying in the harbor of Pensacola, on charges and specifications which alleged the whipping, by order of the accused, of certain persons on board, (colored men,) without the authority of the commander of the ship. This being against the letter of the regulations of the Navy, was made a ground of accusation against Lieut. H. by his commander, Captain Levy, and the men who had been illegally punished were called before the court to testify. Mr. Hooe objected to the competency of these witnesses on the ground of color. His objection was overruled by the court, and afterwards by the President, when the proceedings of the court were reviewed by him."

"It is now urged (with powerful effect, we doubt not) that in this decision, Mr. Van Buren has shown his want of 'Southern principles,' his desire to raise the negro to a level with the white man, and his contempt of Southern rights and Southern institutions. It is not disputed that in Boston or New York, where negroes are competent witnesses in all cases, this kind of testimony against Mr. Hooe might have been received; but it is urged, and herein consists the fallacy of the objection, that inasmuch as the trial took place in the water of a Southern territory, whose policy, like that of the slaveholding States, excludes negro testimony in cases in which white men are concerned, therefore it should have been excluded in the case of Lieutenant Hooe."

"There might be some plausibility in this, if the trial had taken place under the laws of Florida; but this was no more the fact than it would have been, if the frigate had, at the time, been sailing in the middle of the Atlantic ocean. The laws which did govern, and which must always govern naval courts martial, are the laws of the United States; and it is scarcely necessary to remind the intelligent reader that, as universality and uniformity are indispensable attributes of the law, a rule which would, on the same state of facts, convict a man at New York, and acquit him at Pensacola, would not deserve the name of a law."

"That the law which makes the negro as competent a witness as the white man, is unwise and impolitic, we will not stop to prove or even to assert; if, however, the law is to be altered, there is but one power known to the Constitution by which it can be altered, and that power is not the President. To him is given the power to execute the laws; but it is to be hoped that the day is far distant when that officer will feel himself

at liberty to say, 'this law is impolitic, and therefore I will not execute it.' Not even 'Cæsar,' with a Roman Senate at his heels, had dared to hold such language. The sternest despots and the bloodiest tyrants that ever scourged the earth, have done it under the name of the law."

"In regard to most other matters, we disapprove Mr. Van Buren's administration, and especially we disapprove nearly all of those acts of it which relate to Florida; but in the matter spoken of above, he is clearly right, and enlightened public opinion will sustain him."

[We cordially unite with the Pensacola editor in the following tribute to Lieut. Hooe, our countryman.]

"As for Mr. Hooe himself, we know him to be as gallant and noble a fellow as ever trod the deck of a ship. Born at the South and reared with Southern feelings, he was naturally indignant at having the assertions of negroes, though made under the solemnity of an oath, weighed against his character as a gentleman and his honor as an officer. But whatever may have been his feelings on the subject, it is a sufficient justification for the President, that 'thus the law is written.'"

"It is a fact not unworthy of remark, that there have, within the last ten years, been more naval courts martial in this harbor than in all the other ports of the U. S.; and although, in many of these courts, colored witnesses have been called to testify, no question has ever been made as to their competency."

So here our readers will see, in the spontaneous testimony of Mr. Van Buren's political enemies, that he could not have interfered in the Hooe case, without an usurpation of the powers of Congress, and what is more, they demonstrate it by cogent reasoning. This is high authority, and should shut the mouth of every slanderer and mischief-maker about the Hooe case.

But, suppose Mr. Van Buren had sanctioned the introduction of negro testimony against white men, think you, gentle reader, a precedent could be found for it in the South? Read the following, from the New Orleans Great Western, and see what a Whig Judge and a Whig Attorney-General can do as far South as N. Orleans, in regard to such testimony:

"*Negro Testimony*" in New Orleans.

"An extraordinary case came up before the Criminal Court in this city, on the 15th inst., in which 'negro testimony' was admitted and carried to its greatest extent, and upon which testimony the criminal was found guilty and condemned. The persons giving testimony in this case were, Bazile Croker, a free man of color, and widow Louis Dupre, a free woman of color. The judge of the court and the attorney-general of the State, are both leading Whigs. Here is a plain case, and we ask the Federal party, which has been railing out so much about the case of Lt. Hooe, and falsifying the facts of that case, to give us some light on this. Can they relieve themselves of the dilemma in which their indiscretion has placed them? They cannot on the plea of the law, because in the case of Lieut. Hooe, they kicked the law aside, and would not permit it to be justified on that ground. Why did they not protest against this 'negro testimony' under their own noses? where a free white citizen of the U. S. was to be tried almost for his life, the heinousness of whose crime could in no way contribute to the necessity of such evidence—for the law always presumes a man innocent until he is proved to be guilty. The Sax very properly asks the question, 'whether Dr. Hines will be pardoned by the Executive of Louisiana, because he has been convicted on the testimony of two negroes?' We give the following report of the evidence of these two negroes, from the *Picayune*:

"THE STATE versus JAMES WALKER, alias Dr. HINES.—Well, the doctor has at length been brought up to the 'scratch.' 'Dodging' and 'shying' would no longer avail him. A jury was impanelled yesterday, and the trial proceeded. We noticed Mr. Cohen associated with the doctor's other counsel!

The Attorney General opened the case by reading the indictment. It charged the prisoner, Jas. Walker, with having, on the 13th of May last, aided and abetted the slave Nelson, to depart from his master, living in the first municipality, and within the jurisdiction of his court, depriving him thereby of his use and services."

"Bazile Croker, f. m. c. sworn. Witness is owner of a slave named Nelson. He pointed the boy out to the court. Nelson departed from his service on the 15th of May last—heard, about the 30th, that he was in the jail at Natchez, and that he had been carried to that city by two white men who offered him for sale, and were also in prison there. He went to Natchez, got him without any difficulty, and brought him home. He does not, of his own knowledge, know the men who carried the boy to Natchez—heard their names, but does not now remember them."

"Widow Louis Dupre, f. m. c. sworn. Witness lives in Craps street. She knows the prisoner at the bar; he had occupied part of her house. (The slave Nelson was here brought before her.) Witness, recognized him as the boy she had seen with the prisoner; he had lived in that part of the house occupied by the prisoner, for three days in May last. The prisoner had told him that Nelson was his slave—said he had brought him

from his plantation, but as the boy was worthless, he had two white men who would take him back to his plantation again. In answer to questions of cross examination, witness said the prisoner lived in her house two months less five days—saw two other white men there with him.—The intimacy which existed between them was this—she cooked for him, and at times he came to her part of the house and discoursed with her."

But negro testimony is sometimes admitted in our own courts. At a late court in the county of Hanover, near this city, a negro was examined for an alleged rape on a white woman, perpetrated in the absence of her husband. We understand, that four out of the five who constituted the court were Whigs, as well as the Commonwealth's Attorney and the prisoner's counsel. The woman swore positively that the rape had been committed upon her by the prisoner; whereupon Mr. Lyons moved the introduction of four negroes to prove an alibi, or in other words, that the woman had lied. The Commonwealth's Attorney opposed its introduction; but the court admitted it. This matter, from the excitement it produced, got in the papers; and we cut from the Whig of Sept. 12, 1840, the following extract from a communication to that paper by H. Davis, Esq., who is Commonwealth's Attorney, as before stated. It will be seen that he states all the facts necessary to show that such testimony was introduced, and that it was illegally done—yet the very individuals thus admitting the testimony of negroes against woman—injured, violated woman, can escape with impunity, whilst Mr. Van Buren is to be immolated because he could not, if he would, have set aside the decision of the Court Martial in Hooe's case, even if the testimony of the negroes had established any thing.—But establishing nothing, he was bound as he did, to say he saw no ground to justify his interference in the case. But here is the extract from Mr. Davis's communication to the Whig:

"I am, as represented, the Commonwealth's Attorney in the Court in which the criminal was tried. On the part of the prosecution the woman proved that the attempt was indeed a successful one; identified the man, whom she knew well and who lived within a few hundred yards of her house. The fact being thus proved, and her good character well sustained, four negroes were introduced and offered as evidence. I felt it my duty to enquire of the Counsel for the prisoner, whether the negroes were at all cognizant of the fact, or whether they were brought there for the purpose of proving an alibi. Learning, in substance, that their testimony was intended to prove an alibi, I objected to their being received for any such purpose, it being in effect or in fact to array the testimony of negroes against that of a white person, and by numbers to overpower it. The 2d section of the law concerning slaves, free negroes and mulattoes, page 422, 1 vol. Rev. Code, provides that 'any negro or mulatto, bond or free, shall be a good witness in pleas of the Commonwealth for or against negroes or mulattoes, bond or free, or in civil pleas where free negroes or mulattoes shall alone be parties, and in no other case whatever. I have defended and prosecuted probably a hundred slaves and free negroes in the course of my practice, and knew as well as any one that this law declared them 'good witnesses' in pleas of the Commonwealth for or against negroes or mulattoes, bond or free, or in civil pleas, where free negroes or mulattoes shall alone be parties.' I knew, moreover, that it was every day's practice to examine white persons and black persons on the trial of colored persons, and it rarely happens otherwise; yet I had never known an instance in which a fact having been proved by white persons, on the trial of a negro, that negroes were allowed to prove an alibi, and thereby disprove the fact thus established. I maintained that there was a distinction between mere alibi evidence, and evidence generally—that mere alibi evidence, according to all the authorities, 'lies under a great and general prejudice, and ought to be heard with uncommon caution.' If then this kind of evidence should be heard with 'uncommon caution' when coming from white persons, ought it to be heard at all, when coming from negro slaves, against the testimony of white persons? and when, too, a negro was on his trial for an offence against a white person, which, from its nature could alone be proved by such white witness?"

Stranger than all, Mr. Botts himself is not free from the sin of respect for negro testimony. It seems that he can discharge his overseer upon the testimony of his negro, that he had stolen a bag of corn; and yet Mr. Botts affects great horror for negro testimony, though it proved nothing. We take the evidence as we find it in the *Enquirer*, which has never been controverted in the Richmond papers:

"THE HOOE-CASE TURNED."

"HENRICO, Sept. 19, 1840."

"I hope you will pardon me for troubling you with a communication of facts, that came within my own knowledge. In the spring of the year 1837, Mr. John M. Botts had been from home some days. When he returned, his servant Dick (who was his head man)

went to his master and charged his overseer (a white man) with purloining a bag of meal. On receiving this information from his slave, he (Botts) discharged his overseer from his employ. The overseer, being aggrieved that his reputation should be brought in question by a negro, and wishing to establish his innocence, and being ignorant of the law in such case, applied to a justice of the peace for a warrant, to bring the said negro before himself or some other justice, that the false charge might be inquired into. The slave was accordingly apprehended and carried before said justice. Mr. Botts also attended, to see what was to be done with his slave. When the case was ready for hearing, the slave was introduced as a witness, to state what he had said to his master about the meal. He went on to state several things he had said derogatory to his overseer's reputation, when a gentleman present inquired of the justice whom he was trying: if he was trying the negro, he could not give evidence in his own case—if he was trying the overseer, the negro's testimony was not admissible. The negro was then directed to stand aside; and Mr. Botts was introduced as a witness. He went on to state what his negro had told him, for some time, not stating any thing he knew himself—only what the negro had stated to him; when the same gentleman observed that Mr. Botts' testimony was no better than the negro's—that it was hearsay testimony, and what he heard the negro say, and was not legal evidence. Mr. Botts' testimony being objected to by the gentleman, threw him into a violent passion, and he made several remarks about the gentleman's being a political enemy of his, or he would not have interfered. He then asked for a continuation of the case; which was granted.

"The above transaction was at the Yellow Tavern in the county of Henrico, in the presence of a considerable number of gentlemen, and if it is denied, can be proven by those who were present."

"Now, sir, I have given you this plain statement of facts, that you may see how far Mr. Botts sanctions or approves of negro testimony—that you may contrast it with his much ado about negro testimony in Lieutenant Hooe's case."

Postscript.

"September 28.—I had an interview with the magistrate yesterday about Mr. Botts's negro witness. He said he well recollected that Mr. Botts insisted on examining the negro as a witness against his overseer.—and even plead, that he ought to be allowed to do so.—And when the magistrate refused, Mr. B. charged him with being a political enemy of his. And Botts has spoken of the case to several persons since, and complained of his not being allowed to examine his negro."

(From the Globe.)

Now what will the cavaliers say when they find that their own Administration, consisting of their approved favorites, Adams, Clay, Barbour, and Southard, sanctioned (not merely the removal of a navy officer from one station to another, as is the case of Lieut. Hooe,) but a sentence cashiering him, upon the testimony of a negro, sustaining the charge upon which the conviction depended.

We copy so much of the records as will show the nature of the offence—the character of the witness—and the decision of the court, as confirmed by Mr. Adams no doubt, with the advice of Mr. Southard, his Secretary of the Navy, at least, if not with that of his whole Cabinet.

Not one word was uttered by the sensitive partisans of Whiggery in the South, who are, at this moment, and were then, in close hug with the Adams, Clay, Barbour and Southard administration, against this proceeding. They could see an American officer cashiered upon black testimony then, although now they would condemn a President because he would not overthrow legal evidence sustaining a just conviction, on the ground that evidence, questioned as illegal, was given as to other changes, though not sustained by the court upon it!!!

It should never be forgotten, that when the friends of the Administration sought, at the last session of Congress, to put down by law the admission of negro witnesses by court martials, Mr. Botts, together with the Abolitionists and Federalists in Congress, voted down the attempt; the state of business in the House being such as to enable a minority of one-third to defeat the measures proposed by the Democracy.

Extract from the proceedings of a Court Martial held at Philadelphia on the 1st November, 1827, for the trial of Midshipman Farnifold Green.

"David Trusty, a black man, servant of Lieutenant White, being duly sworn, according to law, deposes and says:

"Question.—Do you remember going one night last winter into the mess room of the Independence, by orders of Lieutenant White? State what occurred.

"Answer.—One night Mr. White sent me into the room, to carry a letter for Mr. Green. Mr. F. Green asked me who the letter was for. I said it was for big Mr. Green. There were two Mr. Greens on board. I had forgotten his first name at the time. He told me to hand it to him. I did so. The next thing was, he

inquired what my name was. I told him my name was David Trusty. He asked what Mr. White sent that letter for. I said I did not know what was in it. He said I guess your name is Mr. Black, and then I went out.

"On another time I was sent by Mr. White to the mess-room to get Charles Green's hammock. I frapped at the door two or three times. No person answered. I shoved the door open to go in. Mr. Farnifold Green was standing partly aside of the door, there was a light in the room, so that I could see; I saw him making a blow at me; raised my arm, and received the blow on my arm. It was with a stick; the stick broke over my arm; part of it flew over my shoulder.

"Mr. Green then walked among the hammocks which were hanging in the mess room. I looked at him to be satisfied who he was, and went into the cabin, to tell Mr. White. I went back with Mr. White to the room; we looked round when we first got in, and did not see any person, but presently found Mr. Green lying aside of Mr. Justin on a cot. He had no bed clothes over him. Mr. White asked me if I would swear he was the person that struck me. I told him I would. Mr. White asked him what he was doing there. One word brought on another. After a while, Mr. White told Mr. Green that he had been tempted to thrash him, but that he would not condescend to do it. Mr. Green made answer 'to thrash me? to thrash me?' repeating it two or three times; and at the same time raising his hand, and said: 'I will crush you to billy by God.' Mr. Green had got up out of the cot, and was standing in the room; he was not dressing himself, or doing any thing. I cannot recollect what occurred after that; I went into the cabin leaving Mr. White behind.

"I was at the time the servant of Mr. White, in the service of the U. S., whom I left on the 3d June. I met Mr. White on the 7th or 8th November, in New York, and am now with him in his service.

"The Court found Midshipman Green guilty, and sentenced him to be cashiered; which sentence was approved and confirmed by President Adams, on the 17th day of December, 1827."

But Mr. Botts has addressed a communication to the people of the United States on this subject. This is laughable. To think of Mr. Botts' addressing the people of the United States! to become the President's accuser, and to place himself in the lists of his defamers. Surely this Mr. Botts must expect to be the successor of General Harrison: for, if incompetent and inefficient generalship is to be made the passport to that distinguished station, his arrogance and self-sufficiency is matter of no surprise. Well, what does Mr. Botts attempt to show? 1st. That the case of Green, who was cashiered on the strength of a negro witness, and the sentence approved by Mr. Adams, an Abolitionist, and dear friend to Mr. Botts, was excusable, and that Mr. Van Buren deserved great censure because he could find no ground of interference in Hooe's case, when the negro testimony had established nothing, and when the sentence of the Court neither took away his commission nor his pay, but simply required that he should leave the Florida station because he and Capt. Levy could not agree.

2d. That the case of Drake was one to authorize the interference of the President, and that these two cases, so far from injuring him for non-interfering, showed the practice and usage of the government had been the reverse.

Now, a fair statement of these cases will show that neither of them affects the integrity of Mr. Van Buren's position.

In the first case, negro testimony was actually received, and a sentence founded upon it. This sentence was approved by Mr. Adams, and Green cashiered.—He was re-nominated by Gen. Jackson, and reinstated by the Senate. What has this to do with the Hooe Case, except to show that those who make a merit of abusing Mr. Van Buren, and excusing Mr. Adams, are in favor of negro evidence themselves? The re-nomination by Gen. Jackson only shows that he was opposed to negro evidence, and had no other mode by which to favor an officer who had suffered from it. Mr. Van Buren, whilst he had no power to interfere, and no reason for doing so, as the white testimony was sufficient, has declared himself in favor of extending the law of the exclusion of black witnesses from courts martial, and opposed to the principle of receiving such testimony. What more could he do? Yet Mr. Botts has refused to aid in passing a law to exclude them for fear of offending Abolitionists! Mr. Van Buren is much sounder on this subject than Mr. Botts, for he, we learn from the papers, did actually discharge his overseer on the un-sworn testimony of his negro man. What does the case of Drake show? Does it show that he was dismissed on negro evidence, and that the sentence was set aside on that account? No. It shows, and Major Eaton so declares, that he set aside the decision because he was condemned on hearsay, and that hearsay the evidence of a negro.—Does any body suppose that Mr. V. Buren, if called on, would not have set aside a decision on such a ground? None can but a wilful political bigot. But Hooe was not directed to leave the

Florida station on negro evidence, hearsay or in person, but on good and sufficient white testimony, as all who have had anything to do with the proceedings, including a Whig Court, have said—yet Mr. Van Buren is foully aspersed on this subject. If Mr. Van Buren were guilty of such an outrage on the feelings of his Southern friends, would they justify him in it? No. They would hurl him from his place without the very kind advice of those, at least, who themselves receive and act on negro evidence against white men and women, as has been done hitherto. For one we spurn the false and affected sensibility which is displayed by the Whig slang-whangers on this subject, and pronounce him or them guilty of a base and wilful calumny against the Southern supporters of Mr. Van Buren, who say that they either in thought, word, deed or action, directly or indirectly, would sanction or excuse the testimony of negroes against white men. Yet Mr. Adams did it, and those who charge us on this subject were then as mute as an oyster! But the Whig prints themselves have, in some instances, been compelled to do Mr. Van Buren justice. We have heretofore published what the Lexington Gazette said on this subject. We now ask emphatic attention to the revelations we make to-day. They deserve to be read and weighed by the just and reflecting. They use up John Minor Botts, and refute his idle, vague and unmeaning insinuation sophistry.

The Census Law.

Of all the efforts which have been made to prejudice laboring people against the Administration, there is none more insidious or mean than this. So far as the enquiry comprehended minute statistics, such as "chickens," &c., it was exclusively a Whig measure. Neither Mr. Van Buren nor the Democratic party had any hand or lot in the matter. It was first suggested by Whig Editors—was proposed in Congress by Rice Garland—reported upon by John Sergeant—both rabid Whigs—and sustained by Daniel Webster, and that party exclusively. These are facts; and no man of reputation will deny them.—Yet, men knowing them, will not hesitate to say that it was a measure of Mr. Van Buren's, by which he was seeking to impose a direct tax to support him in Regal authority! Can any just or honest man act with a party so steeped in party injustice and unfairness? But the Editor of the Whig, Mr. J. H. Pleasants, to give this charge prominence, addressed a letter to the country under his own signature, to excite rebellion against the law as one emanating from the throne of a tyrant. But, no sooner had he done so, than he found some of his own good Whig friends lecturing him for his unnecessary interference in a matter of their own creation. The Compiler of this city thus bemoans the rash act of Mr. J. H. Pleasants:

"It is to be regretted, that objections have been made to the queries which the commissioners to take the census are instructed to propound. Those queries are perhaps too numerous, and embrace trifling articles; but the principal statistics sought to be obtained through them are highly important and interesting. We hope they may be fully ascertained, though the objections urged are calculated partially to prevent that—particularly those urged by the senior Editor of the Whig. This country is very much in want of useful statistical information. Professor Leiber of Columbia College, (S. C.) before the law was framed, wrote a most interesting letter to Senator Preston, in which he explained the advantages of such information, and by contrasting our country with others, showed our comparative poverty in statistical matter. This very letter, we have no doubt was the prime cause of appending those queries to the duties of the census takers. If there is any thing wrong in the matter, the President could only be culpable so far as his signature of the bill might involve him. The bill was the work of Congress."

What renders the affected patriotism of the Senior Editor of the Whig still more ridiculous, is, the fact, that the law was not compulsory which required this statistical information, but rested entirely upon the free will, consent and courtesy of the people, for its execution. This is the sum and substance of the census humbug.

Abolition.

We have seen a pamphlet issued from the press in Washington city by the Executive Committee, composed of Abolitionists and slaveholders, in which a labored effort is made to prejudice the South against Mr. Van Buren on the Slave and one or two other questions. We have given it a careful examination, and never have we seen a more disingenuous, deceptive and sophistical production. We warn our friends against its gross and crying injustice towards Mr. Van Buren. What! Clarke, Truman Smith and Saltonstall, notorious and avowed Abolitionists, seeking to displace Mr. Van Buren in the affections of the South, that man who has sacrificed every Abolition friend he had in the world to stand by the South and maintain the integrity of the Constitution! Out upon the hypocrites. The South will never be wheedled by such men as they.

They have attempted to compare Mr. Van Buren and Gen. Harrison. Ist. "On the power of the Federal

Government over slavery in the District of Columbia.

We tell you what Mr. Van Buren before his election in 1836 distinctly said—that if it should be the pleasure of a majority of the American people to elect him as their Chief Magistrate, he would go into the Presidential chair the firm and unflinching opponent of any attempt on the part of Congress to interfere with slavery either in the District of Columbia or the States where it exists—he also said in his Inaugural Address, that he would veto any bill abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia, or interfering with it elsewhere. He has declared since that he would veto a law to abolish slavery in Florida, and that he would sign a bill to admit her as a slave State in the Union. General Harrison's opinions on these matters are unknown to us except by referring to his past acts and letters—his friends appear satisfied with them. We are not, and would not be, even if we knew them to be his present opinions. In the absence of any knowledge of this sort, we can only refer to them for as much as they are worth. In 1829, he said, such was his aversion to slavery, that, at the early age of 18, he had joined an Abolition society in this city. He was then a candidate for office in Ohio, and he was desirous to secure the Abolition or anti-slave interest in that State. In 1819, as a member of the Ohio Senate, he voted for and sustained resolutions denying Missouri admission into the Union, without she would first agree to emancipate her slaves. In his Cheviot Speech, in 1835, he told the Abolitionists of Ohio, that emancipation was "an object near his heart," and that he would agree to appropriate the whole "surplus revenue" of the country towards that object, though he could not then concur with them in their designs to subvert Southern Institutions. In 1826, in reply to a charge that he had thanked his God he had gotten rid of Virginia politics and Virginia negroes, he said it was a "joke." In 1836, he wrote a letter to John McPherson Berrien of Georgia, denying that Congress had power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, but he has never since referred to that letter, as containing his present opinions, or endorsed any compilation in which it is to be found—he has never said, if elected, he would veto a law abolishing slavery—on the contrary, he has written many letters to the North, the contents of one of which only has reached the light, calculated in their tenor and phraseology to induce the Abolitionists to vote for him. Superadded to all this testimony—he was nominated at Harrisburg by the influence of Abolitionists—his friends in Congress, from the North, are in the main Abolitionists. The Northern Legislatures, where his friends have a majority, are Abolitionists, and pass laws amalgamating the whites and blacks, or virtually assailing the rights of the South by jury laws, kidnapping laws, &c., to protect their fugitive slaves. The Abolition presses of the North support him—the Abolition Societies support him—in fine, there is a perfect union of Whigs and Abolitionists all over the Union, North and South, to defeat Martin Van Buren, and elect Wm. Henry Harrison. A circumstance has just reached our ears, which took place in Surry county. Two members of a volunteer company publicly declared, that they were Abolitionists, and supported Gen. Harrison because they believed he was one, and would carry out their views upon that subject.—Whereupon, an excitement arose, which resulted in a meeting of the company, and the striking from the roll the names of the two obnoxious individuals. We mention this, not as reflecting at all on the Whig party of the South, or countenancing the idea that they are Abolitionists; but merely as a circumstance to show, that even here in the South, there are doubtless very many who entertain similar opinions and support Gen. Harrison for a like reason; and that if there be any Whigs, even one, who entertains such an opinion among us, is not the unanimity among them at the North at once accounted for?

2d. "The votes and speeches of Van Buren on the subject of negro suffrage," &c. We again repeat, upon our honor, as Southern men, that Mr. Van Buren deserves well of the South for the bold stand he took against allowing free blacks to vote in New York as they did under the Old Constitution, on the same qualifications with white men. We could have wished it had been in his power to exclude all from the right of voting, even upon any qualification whatever; but Mr. Van Buren could not do this. The negroes had been voting before, and so sudden a disfranchisement of every one theretofore accustomed to the exercise of this right, would not have met the approbation of the people, and thus would have been lost other wholesome reforms, which Mr. Van Buren had, by hard labor, wrought into the new Constitution. That he voted to restrict the right of suffrage to negroes, and not extend it, as is falsely asserted, is shown by his vote against the proposition of Mr. Eastwood, who moved to strike out 250 dollars, the qualification reported by the Select Committee, and insert 100 dollars. But, in the height of party frenzy and injustice, it is asserted, that Mr. Van Buren voted to extend the right of suffrage to negroes, and to restrict it to white men. Now the reverse is the

fact; for, Mr. Van Buren was the champion of the Right of Suffrage in the N. York Convention, and it is mainly owing to his exertions, that that inestimable right was extended to all who paid any tax, performed military duty, or worked upon the public roads. He opposed making magistrates elective by the people, because he thought they might be biased in the administration of justice, according as the parties had voted for or against them at the polls. But, in a late letter to some citizens of his own State, he says he has no reason to believe the system has worked in practice otherwise than well, and he is not disposed to make any change.

3d. "The Negro Testimony."—The case of Murch is relied on in this pamphlet to fortify the position of the Committee, in endeavoring to fix upon the President the charge of having sanctioned negro evidence against white men; but it will be seen, upon an examination of the case, even as they present it, that the question of the competency of black witnesses, was never before the President. See Hooe Case.

4th. "The Missouri Question."—We hardly know which feeling to let predominate, at the mention of this question by the Whig party—disgust or indignation—scorn or ridicule. The Missouri question, in no way connected with Abolition, was gotten up in 1819 and '20, mainly by the present political friends of the Opposition party, and enemies of Mr. Van Buren. It was not a question of Abolition, but a contest for power between the slave and non-slaveholding portions of the country. Mr. Van Buren was then a member of the Senate of New York. All the Northern States passed resolutions against admitting Missouri without restrictions as to slavery. There was no division among the people. New York passed resolutions which Mr. Van Buren may at the time have consented to, as he was bound to do by the will of his people; but there is no evidence to show that he voted for these resolutions, or indeed approved their object, because they passed without a count or division. Gen. Harrison voted for similar resolutions in the Senate of Ohio—yet the Whigs can sustain him without difficulty or objection. Mr. Adams, Mr. Webster, Mr. Sergeant and others of the Whig party at the North, sustained these resolutions. Yet the Whigs of the South could find no objection to Mr. Adams on that account in 1824, immediately after the excitement, nor in 1828. They could find no objection to Mr. Sergeant in 1832, with Mr. Clay, a candidate for the Vice Presidency. And they could find no objection to taking Mr. Webster to their bosom, "Aul fellow well met," on the 5th October last. Their stomachs do not nauseate at all this, nor at an amalgamation of their party with negroes at the North—at the solemnization of marriages between them—at their voting the Whig Ticket there to a man. No! Oh, no! But most wonderfully sick do they become, after feasting on such a mass of putridity, at "the vote of Mr. Van Buren on the Missouri question," "the negro testimony," &c.

5th. "The Arkansas and Florida questions."—The vote which Mr. Van Buren gave in reference to the admission of slavery in the Territory of Florida, bears no analogy whatever to the Missouri or Arkansas questions. The ordinance for the Territorial Government of Florida was reported by a committee of Southern men, and was a literal transcript of the one for Louisiana, which had been penned by Mr. Jefferson, and which excluded the introduction of slaves therefrom, except by citizens of the U. S. removing thither, and owning such slaves at the time of removal, or by citizens of the U. S. travelling in the Territory with not more than two servants. This provision worked well in practice, and Louisiana prospered. It was Mr. Jefferson's—and a similar law exists at this time in all the Southern States. Mr. Van Buren voted against striking it out—that's his offence on this head. The vote which Harrison gave in reference to Missouri and Arkansas was against a total prohibition of slavery in their limits. But of this he repented, when he went home—secured the votes and influence of the anti-slave interest—was elected to the Senate of Ohio, and there took strong ground in direct opposition to his former course, and voted for instructions to keep Missouri out of the Union, unless she would give up her slaves. Can any many deny this? What credit, then, does he deserve of the South? Martin Van Buren has furnished no such evidence of hostility to the South as this.

6th. Abolitionism.—This charge is attempted to be met by the pamphlet before us; but it furnishes nearly all the proof we desire to convict him of his disingenuous course on this subject. We have briefly alluded to it already.

7th. "White Slavery."—This charge is also attempted to be met; but in vain. The record stands in the way. There it is, as large as life. Gen. Harrison did, when Governor of Indiana, approve a law to sell, whip, and imprison his fellow-citizens for trivial offences—for breaches of the penal law—for fines, fees, &c. He voted for a similar law in 1819, in Ohio Senate. In reference to these laws, he says he did right. He approved a law also as Governor of Indiana, requiring a freehold qualification for a poor man to vote.

A variety of other questions are placed in a false light

by this pamphlet—for instance, the "Tariff." Now, if there is any one question more than another, upon which the opinions of the two candidates are better known, it is this of the Tariff. Gen. Harrison's views of a Tariff have no limits—know no bounds. Mr. Van Buren is avowedly in favor of bringing it down to an economical expenditure on the part of the General Government.—As to "Federalism," we think there can be no doubt, after reading what we have said, under that head, that Gen. Harrison always has been and is a Federalist.

The old charge of the Standing Army is vamped up with a few more misrepresentations, and put out to deceive and mislead the public mind. Mr. Van Buren, so far from any design to press the organization of the militia on Congress, in the form proposed by Mr. Poinsett, has not only never approved the plan, but more than once disclaimed it as his own, yet it seems nothing will satisfy our opponents. This charge again is trying to the patience of every just and honest man, that whilst Mr. Van Buren is disclaiming Mr. P.'s bill, and Gen. Harrison is approving his own of 1817, much more objectionable, the Whigs are abusing the President and leading their hero to the skies.—Notwithstanding the conclusive evidence, to prove that Mr. Van Buren was at all times the friend of Mr. Madison and the war, this pamphlet falsifies all history, and undertakes to make the impression, that he actually opposed the war, because he supported De Witt Clinton, who had been nominated by the Republican members of the New York Legislature. De Witt Clinton was an advocate of the war, and a member of the Republican party. There may have been something selfish in New York, to bring him out in opposition to Mr. Madison; but it is very certain, that the reason assigned for it was, that he would perhaps prosecute the war with more energy than Mr. Madison had done. It was not to oppose Mr. Madison so much, as to pay a just tribute to the merits of one of her own distinguished sons. But in these proceedings, Mr. Van Buren took no part. He came into the Senate after the nomination was made, acquiesced in it, and voted for electors favorable to Mr. Clinton, with the whole Republican party of the State. Let us trace Mr. Van Buren from the embargo down to the end of the war.

In 1809, he is found reporting and supporting strong resolutions in vindication of the measures of Mr. Jefferson's administration, then just closed, and denouncing the Federalism of the day in the strongest terms. In 1810, he is found, with equal devotion, reporting and sustaining resolutions in support of Mr. Madison's administration. In 1811, he is again found reporting and sustaining a strong resolution, declaring that he "sustained undiminished confidence in the integrity, wisdom and patriotism of James Madison," and that he was eminently entitled to the esteem and veneration of every consistent Republican. In the Spring of 1812, the Republican members of the New York Legislature nominated De Witt Clinton as a candidate for the Presidency. In April 1812, Mr. Van Buren was elected a member of the Senate of New York. In June, 1812, war was declared. In November, 1812, the Legislature met; and Mr. Van Buren one of a committee for that purpose, wrote a reply to the Governor's Speech, fully sustaining the declaration of war. When that reply was under discussion, he voted against proposed amendments condemning the war. In December of that year he voted for the Clinton Electoral Ticket, because Clinton was the nominated candidate of the Republican party in his State. In March, 1813, he made a report in the Senate laudatory of our brave navy, and evincing continued confidence in the acts of the General Government. He voted for a resolution authorizing the Comptroller to subscribe five hundred thousand dollars, to a loan proposed by the General Government as means for carrying on the war.—He was the author of the eloquent appeal to the people of New York by the Republican members of the Legislature in support of the war, which did much to secure the re-election of D. D. Tompkins to the office of Governor in April, 1813. At the session of 1813-14, Mr. Van Buren was still the eloquent defender of the war, of the patriotic Gov. Tompkins, and of the Republican Administration of the General Government. At the close of the session, on the 14th April, 1814, he addressed a large and general meeting of Republicans at Albany, with great energy and effect; and, in conclusion, presented a preamble, and resolutions eloquent in defence of the war, and in just denunciation of the atrocious conduct of the Federal leaders. His efforts did much to secure the triumph of the Republican party in the Spring of 1814, which placed the entire Government of the State in their hands. At an extra session of the Legislature, held in the Fall of the disastrous year, 1814, Mr. Van Buren was again the author of an eloquent reply to the speech of Governor Tompkins, full of devotion to the rights, interests and honor of his country. The first step was followed up by an ardent support of efficient war measures, among which was an act to raise and put at the disposition of the General Government, for two years, an army of 12,000 men. This act was not only supported, but originally drawn up by Mr. Van Buren. In February, 1815, Mr. Van Buren

drew up the resolutions adopted by the Legislature of New York, approving with enthusiasm of the conduct of Gen. Jackson and his brave army, in the defence of New Orleans. In the same month, he drew up a report recommending to the Legislature a loan of \$350,000 to the General Government to pay the militia, which had been discharged from the service without compensation, in consequence of the exhausted condition of the National Treasury. In that year, he was appointed by the Republican party, Attorney-General of the State, and in the fall, being still a member of the Senate, he was selected to write the answer to the Governor's Speech. Such, during the restrictive measures and the war, was the conduct of a devoted Republican, whom the Federalism of that day and this, conspire to slander and libel by falsehood and forgery.

It is sometimes said, that Mr. Van Buren is in favor of a Bankrupt law. If so, he is in favor of one in the least objectionable shape, avoiding, as he expressly says, all violation of the Constitution, or encroachment on the rights of the States. Congress has power, and Congress only, to pass an uniform Bankrupt law—To be uniform and equal in its operation upon all interests, must be included Banking, as well as individuals. Gen. Harrison voted for the odious Bankrupt bill of 1827.

He is still in favor of a Bankrupt law, as his mind has undergone no change on this, we suppose, as well as other subjects. Where, then, is the merit of complaint? It is not in the law, but in the manner of its execution. It is not in the law, but in the manner of its execution. It is not in the law, but in the manner of its execution.

RICHMOND, Va., WEDNESDAY, OCT. 28.

A man and fraud Government which shall restrain one from signing and sending, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own periods of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the month of labor the bread it has earned. This is the aim of good government.—Mr. JEFFERSON'S INaugural Address.

Treason against the Liberties of the People!

Arise! arise! Fellow-Citizens, or be forever fallen! The Whigs must be put down, or the principles of your Constitution must be prostrated—and your public morals must be corrupted to the very heart's core. Little did we ever dream of the infamy of the means, to which the Whigs of the other States have descended. We detested the arts which they have been practising here as well as elsewhere, to deceive the People by humbugs and to stultify their understandings by appeals to their senses and their passions. But the curtain is now drawn up. The most startling developments are making. The most corrupt frauds are in the course of exposition. They are corrupting the great fundamental principle of the elective suffrage, and poisoning liberty at its fountain head. Arise, fellow-citizens, in all the majesty of your strength, and put down means so infamous, and a party, whose brethren and agents are so corrupt. Well may the Whigs boast of anticipated success. Well may they count upon victory—and consider the battle as fought and won. Well may they toast Wm. H. Harrison at Norfolk as the "President elect;" when they have seen State after State won to them; and when we now come to see the machinery by which they operate elsewhere—when we see money poured out like water to buy up votes; when voters are carried from State to State to control the majority of the resident voters; and the elective franchise itself is sapped by the most insidious arts, and shameless corruption. The whole matter seems to be reduced to a sort of system. Take the following facts:

GEORGIA.—Extract of a letter from a distinguished man, October 18.—"So you see we are beaten. This result was unexpected I believe to both the friends and opponents of the Administration in Georgia. The most sanguine Whigs did not certainly calculate on so large a majority. We entertain but little doubt that the most outrageous frauds have been committed in this Election. It is impossible that it should be otherwise. There was a full vote for Governor last year, and seven thousand votes more were cast in the late Congressional Election than in that. Our Ticket had received a larger vote than Governor McDonald did last October, and it is still beaten four thousand votes. In some Counties fifty, sixty, and as high as two hundred more votes were cast, it is said, than there were voters. You remember the frauds developed by Mr. Ingersoll. The whole country ought to be cautioned against them, and the friends of the Administration every where should be on the alert to prevent them. If we are beaten, it will be by the corrupt practices of our opponents who have abjured honor, and discarded principle in all their operations. We shall make an effort in November.

"I am happy to see the spirit which animates the Democracy of Virginia. It cannot fail to carry that ancient Commonwealth (that has never given a Federal vote) for the Democratic candidate."

FROM OHIO.—A letter from one of the most distinguished men in this State, says, that Governor Shannon received at the recent election 125,000 votes; and that two years ago he had only 107,000 votes after an

excited contest with Vance. Thus Shannon increased his vote 18,000, and yet is defeated by perhaps 15,000; that "a countless number of lawless mercenaries were smuggled into the State; and that the proof is now clear, that some of these voted at five different places on the same day. In Cincinnati alone, 20 of these wretches have been apprehended, and confined in jail, to await the terrors of criminal justice. And prosecutions to punish the same sort of villainy have been commenced in all quarters of the State."

FROM ALABAMA.—The Mobile Register of the 12th says, that "No man supposes that at the last election (in Mobile county) 2,300 legal votes were polled. The thing is unprecedented, and there is no possible way of accounting for the excess except by the argument of fraud. Yet with this fraud we were in the minority only about 95 votes."

The same cry of abominable fraud comes to us from Pennsylvania.—But little did we suppose, that it was so outrageously carried on by the Whigs, until we saw it in the case of Jeffers in Baltimore. His letter is now perfectly authenticated, as appears by the letter of Mr. Hillen, a member of Congress. Our Correspondent also writes us from Baltimore, Oct. 23d:

"More and more is daily, almost hourly, coming to light on the subject, and high names are compromised. Jeffers is admitted, on all hands, to have written the letter, and our Grand Jury has found a true bill against him. The Chief Judge of the Court, without bringing him into court, went to the Judges of the City Criminal Court, and told them that he would be required to do so. The answer was given: 'The Chief Judge of the Court says he knows Jeffers handwriting, and that there is no doubt that the letter was written by Jeffers. The Chief Judge is a warm Whig.'"

But the startling developments just made in New York, throw all the rest into shade. We have not room to lay the dark details before our readers; but refer them to last Tuesday's Enquirer. They are calculated to harrow up every heart, and to arouse the indignant vengeance of an insulted people. Read—read the infamous details—and down, down with the corrupt perpetrators of these revolting outrages. A letter from New York of Friday morning says:

"The excitement is tremendous. I am too busy to say much to you to day. You will recollect that Gov. Seward has rewarded the ring-leaders by giving them some of the best offices in the city. Our liberties are in danger. No wonder that the Whigs and Abolitionists are so certain of electing their candidate, General Harrison. Should he succeed, God only knows what would be the result."

We have no room this morning for the indignant comments which they should call forth. We must reserve them for Thursday. Our respected Correspondent says, that "Stevenson, to whom we are indebted for bringing out their development, is a gentleman of sense and unimpeached credit. Every honest man, who will read his affidavit, and the evidence which supports it, must see that this deep-seated and costly scheme to purchase political power, neither originated with, nor could have been supported by obscure and necessitous men; but that crafty politicians and opulent fund-mongers projected the plan and furnished the means—and pushed forward bolder knaves to do the dirty work, and to receive (as they have done from the Governor of New York) lucrative rewards in place—besides money from others."

An effort has been made by Grinnell, (a member of Congress and also one of the famous Whig Executive Committee at Washington,) Blatchford, &c., to swear off the fraud.—But they only add prevarication and hypocrisy to profligacy of fraud.) They confess to the money, but pretend that Glentworth was sent with it to Philadelphia, only to get men to come on to detect the Van Buren interlopers! The N. Y. Evening Post tears these miserable devices to atoms.

What! would these men have the pear to be rotten before it was even ripe? What a curious web is the complicated Whiggery of modern times! The chains of operations run into each other; but by tracing them throughout, we can thread out the connecting links. Ritson, the Broker in consciences, the man who furnishes the order for 500 mercenary voters for the Baltimore market, like so many sheep for the shambles, is the link between the Jeffers fraud of Baltimore and the Glentworth fraud of New York. Bela Badger is the connecting link between the Whig fraud in New York and the Naylor fraud of Philadelphia. And Jeffers now appears to be connected both with the frauds in Baltimore and New York.

These vile agents and their corrupt principals behind the curtain, would realize, if they could, the saying of Jugurtha, as he was turned adrift from the gates of the mistress of the world; that every thing was venal at Rome, (*Omnia venalia Romæ*!) and that she only wanted a purchaser in order to obtain a Master. But thanks to the people of America, they are not yet to be bought and sold. They will visit upon the heads of these corrupt men, the just vengeance of an insulted country.

Van Buren Electoral Ticket.

1st District	ARTHUR SMITH,	Of I. of Wight.
2d do	JOHN CARGILL,	Suass.
3d do	JAMES JONES,	Nettowsy.
4th do	WM. R. BASKERVILLE,	Mecklenburg.
5th do	CHARLES YANCEY,	Buckingham.
6th do	RICHARD LOGAN,	Halifax.
7th do	ARCHIBALD STUART,	Patrick.
8th do	WILLIAM JONES,	Gloucester.
9th do	AUSTIN BROCKENBROUGH,	Essex.
10th do	JOHN GIBSON,	Prince William.
11th do	J. D. HALYBURTON,	New Kent.
12th do	THOS. J. RANDOLPH,	Albemarle.
13th do	WALLER HOLLADAY,	Spotsylvania.
14th do	INMAN HORNER,	Fauquier.
15th do	JAMES GIBSON,	Hampshire.
16th do	WM. A. HARRIS,	Paga.
17th do	JACOB D. WILLIAMSON,	Rockingham.
18th do	WM. TAYLOR,	Roanoke.
19th do	AUG. A. CHAPMAN,	Norfolk.
20th do	JAMES HOGG,	Palmet.
21st do	WM. BYARS,	Washington.
22d do	BENJAMIN BROWN,	Cabell.
23d do	JOHN HINDMAN,	Brooke.

In the Tickets already printed, substitute the name of James Gibson, of Hampshire, for that of Jerome L. Opie, of Jefferson. In the Tickets already issued, strike the P. from the name of W. Taylor of Rockbridge.

Printed Copies of the above Electoral Ticket, will be furnished to Committers, &c., at this Office.

Cheering from Old Virginia.—All our Correspondents, all our information, is most encouraging.

Correspondent from Mecklenburg assures us of a majority of from 250 to 300 in that county—in Halifax from 4 to 500—thus giving a clear majority to Van Buren, of from 7 to 1000. We understand, we shall carry from 5 to 1000 in the Henry District. Our friends in Prince George are most active—among them, may we not recognize one of her most honest and able citizens, whose feelings were inclined to the side of the Opposition, but who, consistently with himself and his own previous course at another important epoch, has sought information from Gen. Harrison, to dissipate his doubts, but has sought it in vain?—We have also received the Proceedings of the Convention which assembled at Abingdon on the 15th, composed of Delegates from the counties of Lee, Scott, Russell, Tazewell, Smyth, Wythe, Grayson and Washington. Their address breathes the finest spirit—and a Committee consisting of Delegates from each county to estimate the probable aggregate majority in their Congressional District for Martin Van Buren at the approaching election, reported the probable majority at 1,825. In a word, every sign looks bright in the Old Dominion.—And the drivelling Editor of the Petersburg Intelligencer, who, with a view of misleading his brethren elsewhere and keeping up their spirits, has the audacity to assert that we "have not the slightest hope that (our) party can carry Virginia," asserts what is false and what he ought to know is false.

TO THE PATRONS OF THE CRISIS.

In announcing the discontinuance of this paper with the present number, according to the terms of its publication, the undertakers can but return their thanks for the very liberal encouragement they have met with—an encouragement fully commensurate with the outlays of time and money they have had to bestow in furnishing it to 6,000 subscribers for the period of 5 months. If it has not been every thing they could have wished, in the style and manner of its Editorial management, they at least trust, that no subject of a public and important political nature, in any way connected with the pending canvass, has been permitted to pass by without a proper and candid exposition of its whole bearing upon the merits of the two parties claiming the ascendancy in the councils of the nation. They have endeavored to present, in a fair and clear light, all the various questions which have agitated the public mind.—They think they have successfully met and refuted all the objections which have been urged against the Administration.

They have shown, that Mr. Van Buren is eminently entitled to the support of the freemen of the country; that from a poor and friendless boy, he has risen by his own unaided exertions to the first station in the world; that he was the friend of Jefferson, Madison, Monroe and Jackson; that he was the unflinching advocate of the late war, and did more to bring it to a successful issue, than any man in the United States, who was not actually in the field. They have time after time proved the utter falsity of the charges against Mr. Van Buren, about the Missouri question—the free negro vote—the House case—the army bill—the expenditures—the defaults—the census, and a hundred other baseless fabrications to ruin him in the good opinion of the people. On these subjects, the public mind has been furiously beset by the Opposition; but we think ourselves entitled to fully as much credit in these matters, as the Whigs, and are perfectly willing to abide the issue.

On the contrary, we have lost no time in exposing the veiled and incompetent candidate of the Whigs. We have reviewed all his acts as a public man. We have held him up in his true colors.—We have proven him a Federalist of the deepest dye. We have ridiculed the pretensions of a man to the confidence of a people to whom he will not disclose his opinions, his principles or designs. In fine, we have done all that lay in our power.—We have done our duty.—The People must decide.—To THE PEOPLE, then, we leave it.

DON'T HESITATE! DON'T HESITATE!!

This No. contains information bearing upon nearly all the points in controversy between the Democratic and Federal parties. Keep it in your hand, and meet with it the enemy on the day of the election. Don't hesitate—Don't falter in your onward course by any thing they can tell you, though they swear themselves as black as ENEMIES. For further information about Federal falsehoods, see Enquirers, Oct. 29 and 31. GET IT, IF YOU CAN.

What does O K stand for on the vault of a Bank?—*Out of Cash.*

What does it stand for in a Whig newspaper? *Out of Credit.*

What does it stand for at a Whig festival? *Out Korne!*

What will it stand for after November elections? *Out Kougnered.*

